

17  
AN APOLOGY.

The Protestant Episcopal Society

FOR THE

Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge:

ITS ORIGIN, CONSTITUTION, TENDENCIES, AND WORK;

SUBMITTED TO THE IMPARTIAL JUDGMENT

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY JOHN A. GRAY, 95 & 97 CLIFF, COR. FRANKFORT ST.

1854.

## PREFATORY NOTES.

---

1. *This APOLOGY, though prepared by an individual in the temporary and partial service of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, is published without the authority of its Executive Committee or Officers.*

2. *It is stereotyped at the cost of a number of laymen, who think it calculated to do good, the funds of the Society being all applied to the specific and sacred objects for which they were contributed.*

3. *It will be sent by mail to any names that may be sent to No. 11 Bible House, New-York.*

# AN APOLOGY.

---

INDIVIDUALS will have no place in this tract. It is not written to vindicate men or to condemn men, but to settle some of the gravest questions, not merely of Christian expediency, but of *principle* and of *duty*, now before the Church.

An "Apology," in its scientific sense, being necessarily controversial, at least in form, we open the present one with a few concise thoughts upon *controversy*.

*Comparatively* it is and shall be our strange work; but we have no sympathy with that sickly, unilluminated prejudice which pauses not to consider whether the controversy be waged about the construction of a rubric or about the very vitals of the Gospel, a prejudice under which holiness flourishes as little as truth. The Apostles were strenuous in argument offensive and defensive, following the example of our Lord; nor will the causes or usefulness of it cease until his second coming in glorious majesty to judge the world. St. Paul struggled on in controversy to the end. Oh! for the spirit of that apostle whose most ardent contentions for the faith were dictated by fidelity to the souls of those who had corrupted it—contentions not less strenuous in the immediate prospect of death. They were as benevolent as they were strenuous, nay, it was the very intensity of their benevolence which made them so strenuous. Yield in non-essentials he always did; but cease to contend for truth in its integrity, or for the best appliances for its propagation, he *never* did. Nor let us be told that such controversy will quench the Spirit; so far from it, times of *such* controversy have been times of the most glorious revivals of religion, as in the sixteenth century, and as now in



Ireland, where controversy is avowed, systematic, and unceasing. But look at the spirit of the men by whom it is carried on! And how does it become such as we are solemnly to consider that the controversy which works with the Spirit, and even calls it down, is no personal or ecclesiastical antagonism, or contentions about inferior questions, but that which with the energy of love takes hold of doctrines and of measures of vital interest to the soul, and looks steadily to the salvation of every party.

But as this is the less grateful part of our work, just as in the ministry it is less grateful to tell of the error and sin of man than of the love and mercy of God, and as there is in it, even when most just and imperative, some mixture of evil, it will be our purpose to dispatch it in the shortest space compatible with such thorough execution as will save the necessity of returning to it again in this form.

The Evangelical Knowledge Society was assailed at its organization by individuals here and there, though with such indiscretion that no very formal reply was thought necessary. In fact, the chief points *then* occupied against it have since all been abandoned; such, for example, as that it had adopted a new *creed*, that it was an *unauthorized* Society in distinction from one that was authorized by the Church; that it gave membership and a right to vote by the payment of money. This last feature of the Evangelical Knowledge Society has been adopted by its opponents, and so of others. But as time passed on and its work became more extended, and its usefulness, as we had supposed, generally *manifest*, these attacks had nearly ceased.

But it turns out to our surprise, that during the last General Convention, (which was spoken of, and we had hoped truly, as the harbinger of approaching concord,) the Protestant Episcopal Sunday-School Union was devising measures, the chief object of which, as since appears from their development and the publications which have followed, was to bring the Evangelical Knowledge Society to an end. We view these measures, so far as they have this design, not only with surprise but with regret, as they compel us to re-traverse ground which we supposed we had finally passed on our way to the city of peace.



Allusions to the past history of the Union are now deprecated, and we are told that by-gones must be by-gones. But the present position and policy of the Union utterly forbid this. Here, as in history, without a knowledge of the *past*, it is not possible to understand the *present*. We shall not, however, go further into the antecedents of the Union than is necessary to test its right to make this assault upon the Evangelical Knowledge Society—an assault, be it observed, not upon its doctrine (which it would gladly have discussed) but upon its person.

The Protestant Episcopal Sunday-School Union was organized in October, 1826, with the distinct understanding that it should not be a party Society. In May of the following year, the Convention of Virginia, at the instance of Rev. William Meade, passed a resolution recommending it. But in August, 1827, not three months after the passage of the resolution, the mover discovered that the Union was violating the implied pledge by recommending, instead of the genuine edition of Mrs. Sherwood's stories, one which had been mutilated in Baltimore by the interpolation of the High-Church theory of baptism, and the lowering of the tone of the book on the doctrine of human depravity, and by publishing certain matter in catechisms by Bishop Hobart. At the same time similar complaint was made by a distinguished clergyman at the North who has since become a Bishop. To these complaints the Secretary, Rev. W. R. Whittingham, made a reply very similar to those which the Union has since resorted to. He promised that the recommendation should be withdrawn, and as an offset to Bishop Hobart's catechism, he promised that the views of Low-Churchmen should also be represented. So we understand the following extracts from his letter: "The Society shall not be 'the tool of a party.'" "We may sometimes sanction works which all our brethren may not cordially approve, but if we do this in favor of one set of opinions, it will also be done in favor of another; and if both can be supplied and suited, neither can have reason to complain." How far the Union has redeemed this pledge is very well known. Matters grew worse instead of better under the local influence which predominated in New-York City, which influence for the time being has always in fact governed the Union.



Hence, upon the very first appearance of Tractarianism, under the patronage of Bishop B. T. Onderdonk, the Union began to publish and send it broadcast among the children of the Church. The threatened corruption of the Church became so alarming that at the meeting of the Board of Missions in 1846 there was a meeting of a number of Bishops to take counsel as to the proper mode of arresting so great an evil. They remonstrated with the Managers, who directed sets of all their publications to be sent to the Bishops for their examinations. As the result of this examination by the Bishop of Virginia, he published in 1846, a pamphlet of 60 pages, 8vo, showing, by a great number of citations, how the worst features of the system had been wrought into the very texture of their books. To this pamphlet the chief officer then in charge replied, in a letter addressed to its Board of Managers with their evident approbation, in which he justified the Union's teaching throughout, treated the Bishop with ridicule and great personal disrespect, and intimated plainly enough that no change need be expected.

In 1847, the Convention of Virginia rescinded its resolution, and we believe two or more Conventions which had passed similar resolutions, rescinded them.

After a further delay of near two years, and a somewhat extensive conference among the friends of evangelical truth, they deemed themselves called upon by the plainest obligations of duty, to organize an institution for the use of the press. Such an institution was organized during the General Convention of 1847. But it was on a different and much more extensive plan than that of the Sunday-School Union. It was pledged by its constitution to propagate not merely in the shape of "Sunday-school books" but of "tracts and other larger works, the principles and doctrines of the Gospel embodied in the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies of the Protestant Episcopal Church." It put forth a declaration of the sense in which it *received* these standards entitled "*Distinctive Principles*," etc., a tract, which so far as we know, has never been even controverted. The Society was of course *voluntary*, and designed obviously for those who held its "principles." As to its *form*, it proposed to do more through the wider scope of its operation than had at that time ever been contemplated by



others; while as to its doctrine and spirit, it proposed to supply a Church literature, not only free from Romish error which had corrupted the Sunday-School Union on its narrower basis, but which should be *positively evangelical* in such sense as the literature of the Union had never been, or had ever promised, or promises now to become. It proposed a great work irrespective of Tractarianism or the Sunday-School Union. Its members wanted for themselves, not only in their Sunday-schools but in their families and parishes, such a literature as they had before in part to go out of the Church for, and in part to supply by very inadequate means from among themselves; such a literature as not only Tractarianism but High-Churchism has neither produced or tolerated, or can produce or tolerate without such a change of its essential principles as we have no right to look for in our day.

After the Evangelical Knowledge Society was formed, and had been joined by eight Bishops, (including the then presiding Bishop,) and favored by six others, three of whom, at least, including the Foreign Bishops, are in as full sympathy with it as though they were members, and by a large and powerful body of clergy, including, as will not be denied, a large amount of the practical efficiency of the Church, it was assailed as already stated; but the ground taken was found wholly untenable. But the Union stoutly defended its Tractarian issues, said they were sound, and that it soared above all party influences, and went on, as might be expected, to add other publications equally offensive, which is true of its very last issue that we have seen published since the appointment of the Revising Committee, and which has been sent without order into evangelical parishes. As it claimed to have all the Bishops for members, the presiding Bishop sent in a remonstrance against its teaching as *Romish*. He was replied to by the present editor in terms little more respectful than those in which the Bishop of Virginia had been replied to, reâffirming the soundness of the Union's books. So matters stood until the meeting of the last General Convention. Meanwhile Tractarianism had suffered great reverses, in which the Union had shared. Bishop Ives and several other of its leading friends had joined the Church of Rome, while others had suffered an almost equally fatal prostration of character. Added to this,



the Evangelical Knowledge Society had come into much greater notice. Its moderation and soundness of doctrine was unchallenged, and the distinctness and energy of its religious teaching was procuring for it a more extended usefulness and acceptance. Under these circumstances the Union came together last October. Much had been said in former reports of its prosperity ; but we suspect that but for its endowments received in its earlier and sounder years, it could with difficulty have met its expenses.\* However this may be, the public were surprised by the news that the Union was about to purify itself from Tractarianism, expurgate its list of books, etc. This measure was understood to emanate from a third party whose sincerity could not then or now be suspected, and it awakened hope, more or less, according to men's experience and knowledge of systems and of things. But as the first palpable work growing out of this movement is an elaborate attack upon the Evangelical Knowledge Society by the Union itself, it becomes necessary to examine it in detail.

In the first place, the Union enlarged its name by the addition of "Church Book Society,"† thereby coming formally into that department of Church literature which the Evangelical Knowledge Society had long occupied.

• In the second place, the Union gave up the claim of being any thing more than a *voluntary* Society. But even this claim has been abandoned only in words, not in fact ; for although under the strict government of a party, it still retains the name of "*general*;" it makes all the Bishops officers, and all the clergy members. This was strongly pointed out at the meeting as a violent proceeding, wholly inconsistent with the idea of a voluntary society, and a wrong done to those Bishops and others who

\* In proof, vide last Triennial Sermon, page 29.

† If in addition to this change, there shall be effected the promised change to a *Sunday-school* literature substantially different in doctrine from what it was before, the Union becomes virtually (though not literally) a new Society, and the junior by six years of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, thereby cutting off its only plausible argument for claiming the entire field—priority of organization. It had indeed begun to publish books somewhat earlier, and among them "A Presbyterian Minister Looking for the Church," and a book of worse tendency has probably never issued from a religious press ; and the Union has had the shame of being advised by *The Churchman* to suppress this book eight months after the promise of revision was given.



had protested against being thus forced into their Society. But this counsel was overruled by an almost unanimous vote, and in the "Union's Statement and Appeal" lately published, all the bishops and clergy are again reported as members, and their sanction to that document (which is a virtual attack upon a portion of them) is assumed, a proceeding about as fair, honorable, and promotive of peace and confidence, as it would be in the present writer to affix the names of Bishops Doane, De Lancy, and Whittingham to this Apology, and send it to themselves and their dioceses.

This wrong is not at all mitigated by the fact, that numbers have joined together in its commission.

In its Statement and Appeal, the Union claims "a sanction of consent, if not of law, which places it in a position which none other can well rival;" and the names of Bishop White and Dr. Milnor are given elsewhere as parties to this consent. Every one knows the violence done by the Union to the views of Bishop White. What course he would have taken to counteract its teaching had he been living, the writer can not say, and perhaps no one can; but that it could have *retained* the sanction of his "consent" is a very unlikely supposition. With regard to Dr. Milnor, nothing could be more certain than that he would have been foremost in the formation of the Evangelical Knowledge Society had he been living at the time, and that he would be the last now to listen to the substitute which is proposed for it. If he had such doctrinal differences with Bishop *Hobart*, what would they have been with the Sunday-School Union of late years? We were surprised to see the attempt made to separate him in judgment from the present evangelical body. The moral value of this consent, as will be seen also in other parts of this Apology, is simply nothing at all. There has been no "consent" concerning it of late years, so "general" as that in its condemnation.

The attempt to claim the sanction of the whole Church as it now stands, for the publications of any one Society, however constituted, is absurd. Even the House of Bishops, when urged by Bishop Henshaw to publish by authority a few simple commentaries on parts of the Prayer-Book, refused by a unanimous vote except his own. It was conceded that the attempt, if carried out, would divide the Church. Shall then a voluntary Society



composed of a single party, and (until lately, at least) of the most ultra of that party, attempt to force the sanction of all?

But in the third and chief place, it was stated that the Union was willing to let its Tractarian books be dropped or modified. In this, which was looked upon as the great movement, the prominent officers of the Union did not appear; but another party, who had occupied an isolated position, came in and averred that the books were unsound. This was allowed to pass, apparently by a previous understanding of certain parties, although not without considerable demurs, for it was denied in under-tones that the books were unsound, and that they were unsound was not probably the opinion of the majority present, nor was the question put to vote; but the individual assertion was allowed to pass, and the party making it was associated in a commission for revising the books, subject to the decision of the Executive Committee. It has been subsequently stated that a Bishop prominent in the Union proposed to a Bishop opposed to its publications, to take part in their revision. The Bishop last referred to remembers no such proposition in any shape, and is sure that nothing passed to justify the impression which this statement is likely to make. The error may as well be corrected, though it is not probable that he could have been engaged in so impracticable an undertaking.

A preamble and resolutions were introduced by the same party, which, as they seem to have been made the basis of all the attacks which the Evangelical Knowledge Society has suffered from the Union ever since, and which have produced this Apology, will require more careful examination. The preamble begins as follows, "Whereas there is among the great body of Churchmen in this country substantial unity upon matters of vital interest," etc. As prepared by the mover, this was more doubtfully expressed; but at the instance of Bishop Doane, it was made absolute and positive as at present. We do not certainly know what those who voted for this preamble mean by "matters of vital interest;" but in the sense which the words naturally convey, this is not true, and we propose to show that it is not true, and that all action based upon the assumption of its truth will first mislead and then fail. In defense of this preamble, it has been alleged, that "the Tractarians are a small but active minority." Let us see



whether this is a safe foundation to go upon. The question is hard to settle with those who are more concerned, from whatever cause, for outward *unity* than for *union* in the *truth*, since there is so much dispute as to where the line is to be drawn between Tractarianism and its historical predecessor, old High-Churchism. But the mass of our people will have no difficulty in deciding. We shall be safe in assuming that if there ever have been any Tractarians in the Church, Mr. Arthur Carey was one of them. The two clergymen who, after the avowal of his Romish opinions at his examination objected to his ordination, were, for so doing, ostracized by the diocese of New-York, and the survivor of them is still ostracized, although he had previously been distinguished by the favor of Bishop Hobart and of the diocese. Dr. Seabury will also be admitted to be a Tractarian, for he openly avowed and preached the principle of Tract No. 90. "THE *principle of this tract* (*Churchman*, 14th of March, 1846) WE DID NOT HESITATE TO ADOPT; *and we can only look back on the intemperate opposition which it has received with a sense of shame, not for the Church, for it is no growth of hers, but for humanity.*" After this avowal, Dr. S. was the first choice of the clergy of New-York for Bishop, and but for the intervention of the laity, he would now have been the Bishop of that diocese. This argument in proof of the strength of the Tractarian party has been often made, and never has been or can be refuted. It is uniformly passed by. The lowest view that can be taken of it is, that the majority of the clergy of the largest diocese in the Church, consider the adoption of the *principle of Tract No. 90*, which shocked the moral sense of Christendom, as no bar to the episcopate. It is this party which was then, and is now, in the practical control of the Sunday-School Union, and we are reproached for not giving up to it the exclusive work of publishing Church books, or some will say, for not uniting with it, where our voices will be heard just as long as it is convenient to hear them and no longer.

Again. The organ of the extreme Tractarian party has, if its own statement is to be taken, the largest, or next to the largest weekly circulation in the Church. Tractarianism was also strong enough to prevent any resolutions to its disparagement passing the General Convention on the only occasion on which

it was ever attempted, and finally, by the admission of the parties themselves who now put forth this plea, it was strong enough to govern this same Sunday-School Union which claims to represent a majority of the whole Church. Now, it either did represent the majority on the 18th day of October last, or it did not. If it did, then the majority was Tractarian. If it did not, but only a small but active minority, then upon what bottom do its superior pretensions now rest? Or if it be said that on the 18th day of October it changed its principles, (a point which we shall presently consider,) then *virtually* (not literally) it became a new Society, and is now very young, and must, like other young societies, make its way by character. So much for the *preamble*; and this is scarce a tithe of the evidence that it can not be true, and that any action which rests upon its assumption will be a practical surrender by the evangelical portion of the Church of the vantage-ground which the truth is now attaining.

We now come to the principal *resolution* under the preamble. It reads as follows: "*Resolved*, That *without expressing any opinion upon the doctrinal merits of any work heretofore issued*, this Society approve and commend the declared purpose of the Executive Committee and Editor, as referred to in the Triennial report, and recommend its execution in revising their issues, and taking from their lists, or modifying any which may have been found *seriously* objectionable to any *large body* of Churchmen, retaining such only as belong to that ample field of Christian instruction in which Churchmen generally can meet and labor." The resolution was obviously very distasteful, but it passed without an opposing vote, though the chairman (Bishop of New-Jersey) remarked that some of the *earlier* publications needed revision much more than the later ones.

The Union adjourned, and it was significantly said by one of its active friends, that it had taken the wind out of the sails of the Evangelical Knowledge Society. On the 7th November the Executive Committee appointed a committee to revise the books, and on the 11th of January a committee to prepare a "Statement and Appeal." Both have reported to the public, and simultaneously with their reports came a circular from another committee with the editor as chairman, addressed also to the known friends and officers of the Evangelical Know-



ledge Society, asking the introduction of books and to be put in communication with Sunday-School superintendents, etc. This was apparently designed to take advantage of the first impression of the Appeal before any part of the promised revision had been reported. And to the amazement of not a few, there was sent out at the same time another part of the "*Catechist's Manual*," a publication issued six months after the appointment of the Revising Committee. The Tractarian teaching of this catechism has been shown at length in a very able review re-published in a pamphlet from the *Episcopal Recorder*, to the careful perusal of which the reader is commended. It brings new facts to light of the existence of which many were not aware.

We now come to the "Statement and Appeal." It is kind in language, but not less determined in purpose, insinuating the charge of "ultraism and miserable party feelings against those who do not yield to its demands." But we must endeavor to do our duty even at the hazard of this imputation. We observe first, that the "Statement and Appeal" is founded upon the promised work of revision; secondly, that this work of revision is founded upon the preamble and resolution; and thirdly, that the preamble and resolution are founded, the first in an error of fact, as we have already shown, and the second in an error of principle, as we shall now endeavor to show:

In the first place, the resolution looks to no absolute standard of truth; not to the Bible, not even to the Prayer-Book, but only to the removal of such matter "as may have been found seriously objectionable to any large body of Churchmen." This is very indefinite, and hence we are prepared to find no committal of the *Union* against the doctrine heretofore taught as unsound. The very opening of the resolution is not only unsatisfactory, but altogether inadequate to the demand which its former history has created in the mind of the Church: "Resolved, that *without expressing any opinion upon the doctrinal merits of any work heretofore issued*," etc. And even the Revising Committee tell us in their report, that they must not be understood as concurring in all the objections made. The *Union* itself is manifestly not committed to any thing except the *inexpediency* of this doctrine; and if at a future day it should become more popular, and no large body of Churchmen be

found seriously to object to it, what pledge now given would they break if those who have heretofore governed the Union and who govern it now, and who must hold this doctrine to be true, should reproduce it? Under this resolution as interpreted by the Revising Committee, (pages 12, 13,) it is not proposed to condemn these errors, or to teach any thing directly incompatible with them, but only to substitute in their place certain equivocal expressions from the interpretation of which all these evils sprung in the first place. This no doubt is the best the Committee could do. We do not censure them for ill success. It grows out of the extreme difficulty of the undertaking, of which they are not insensible, for we read (Appeal, page 4,) "On the one side it will be said, that too much has been conceded, *though there has been no giving up of peculiar views, but only of their expression, through this Society, and that for the sake of peace.*" If it was "not difficult" on the part of the Committee "to anticipate this cavil," (for there are discontents and heart-burnings already,) much less was it difficult to anticipate that which follows. "On the other hand, it will be said that no concession has been made, or if any, it has been extorted by determined opposition." [Are the Committee prepared to *deny* that this concession has been "extorted by determined opposition?"] To this it has been added in a private defense of the work: "Nor can any reasonable person imagine that when the work of revision has been completed, all will be perfectly satisfied with all the revised publications of the Society; but he will be content if the grosser objectionable features are removed, and use his liberty of choice among its books of instruction and volumes for the library." These are hard conditions truly. He must confine his liberty of choice to the issues of this Society, he must read before he purchases, and then be content to find the *grosser features* of error removed from those which he takes, or be accounted unreasonable.

We are now prepared for another view of this subject, and one not less worthy of a candid and fair consideration. Let us suppose the Revising Committee to carry out all that they propose—to have gone through this long catalogue, and suppressed one book and modified another, and substituted more indefinite language in a third, until the whole shall merely



teach *High-Churchism* as the same was taught under Bishop Hobart "twenty-five years ago." Would this be satisfactory even to the High-Church party, a majority of whom under forty years of age, have drifted away from the stand-point of Bishop Hobart, to say nothing of Tractarians, Anglo-Catholics, Ecclesiologists, etc.? And as to the evangelical party, they never did admit that that which was peculiar to Bishop Hobart, fairly represented Scripture or our standards. They strenuously opposed his views in his day, as they have done with vastly augmented numbers since. Where again would be the safety of his platform? The General Theological Seminary was upon his platform, and yet it fell under the influence of Tractarianism almost as soon as it appeared. The Sunday-School Union was upon his platform, which in this case also proved equally insecure. Suppose it could be brought back to that platform, (which is all that is aimed at,) so that it would be fairly described under the title of a voluntary "Protestant Episcopal Sunday-School Union and High-Church Book Society," where would be the safeguard against a repetition of the unhappy experience of the last fifteen years? Where would be the prospect of promoting *union* by this mechanical *unity*, in a Society for printing books? Would not that which the Evangelical party hold as pertaining to the very life and power of the Gospel, respecting the relative position of God's word—of faith, as compared with the sacraments—and of the office and work of the Holy Ghost, be carrying them continually counter to the teaching, spirit, and favorite formulas of old High-Churchism even?

But we are prepared to go a step farther. Suppose not only the "grosser features" of error, but all error, in the shape of direct and dogmatic statement, could be cast out of these books, so that as it respects the evangelical system, they should be simply neutral—for no one dreams that any thing *distinctively* evangelical would be allowed, or that any one of the works written by five or six Bishops for the Evangelical Knowledge Society would be permitted upon the shelves of the Union—can it be thought that evangelical ministers, parents, and teachers, would now be content with this *negative orthodoxy*, or consent to any arrangement which would forbid their publishing, and having, and circulating such works as "The Sinner's



Justification before God," "The Right and Responsibility of Private Judgment," "The Freeness of Grace and the Assurance of Hope," and many kindred works? We are amazed that such an expectation can be entertained. We had supposed that the value attached to doctrine by the evangelical body, and their views of truth and of duty, were differently estimated. *Faults of OMISSION in a Society which proposes to furnish our all of Church literature in this form, may be as effectual a bar to its acceptance as faults of COMMISSION.*

We doubt whether the suppression of truth be not worse than the printing of error, provided truth is left free to combat it, which under the rule of the Committee it would not be.

The substitution of expressions from the Prayer-Book left to the selection of certain parties and separated from other expressions, would leave room for thorough party work, and be about as wise as it would be to give up to Unitarians the work of teaching the doctrine of the Trinity under the stipulation that they should use only a selection of passages from the Bible made by themselves. We would solemnly ask the Revising Committee towards whom, so far as we know them, we have the kindest feelings, whether they think that this movement originated in a real wish on the part of a majority of those represented in the Union for a more evangelical literature? So far as they can show this, they will win the evangelical side, and no farther. But on the contrary, so far as it is a stroke of policy either to promote "unity," or, as one said, to take the wind out of the sails of another Society, it can not prosper.

If the Union really desires a more evangelical literature, the very announcement of this desire, *ought*, with its endowments, to insure the means of its publication. But we see not how the promised change can possibly be effected. The little which the Union will allow the Revising Committee to do will produce disaffection in some, while it will give no satisfaction at all to those whom they wish to draw in.

The idea of reducing our Church teaching upon the ministry and the sacraments and other questions of stirring interest to a system of mere negations can never at this day be seriously contemplated by more than a very few persons. This is already discovered, and the attempt virtually abandoned before



it was well begun, at least in any such sense as the "Statement and Appeal" would have led us to anticipate. This we infer not only from the intrinsic difficulties of the work but from the language of the *Church Journal*, which is more friendly to the enterprise of the Revising Committee than any other paper in New-York. While acknowledging that the books had been too one-sided, it entered a demur against any extensive expurgation, for which it assigned reasons which have great weight on the score of practicability under the circumstances in which the Union is placed, and suggested a remedy in the enlargement of the basis of the Union by allowing persons of other views to come in and express themselves, and after a pause of two weeks the *Journal* says of this proposed modification of the plan set out in the "Statement and Appeal," which, in fact, amounts to its nullification: "The views expressed by us, week before last, suggesting an extension of the basis of the Society's publications, rather than any very extensive expurgations or modifications of works already issued have been received with a degree of favor from men of all parties" (we suppose it means all High-Church parties) "in the Church as strengthens not a little our conviction that this is the only satisfactory course that can be adopted."\* That is to say, for the sake of silencing the evangelical portion of the Church and arresting their work, the *Church Journal* is for repeating the promise of 1827, and proposes the opening of a valve in the Union for the expression of Low-Church sentiments, with the publishers of the "Catechist's Manual" set to watch it. At what point the valve would be closed we are not informed, but there would not probably be any great pressure of matter seeking utterance through such a frugal opening.

We ask then, in concluding this part of our Apology, whether it be not perfectly manifest that the extraordinary claim of the Sunday-School Union to control the literature of the Church in this form, is wholly unwarranted, either by its past history or its present professions?

But in immediate connection with this claim the Union has made a formal attack upon the Evangelical Knowledge Society.

\* The recently altered tone of *The Churchman* also indicates that it apprehends no danger to the integrity of its faith from the operations of the Committee.



The very drift of its "Statement and Appeal," its Revising Committee, and its promised expurgations, is to supersede it. Assuming in the first place, that its promised reform was practicable and sure to be accomplished, and in the second place, that when carried to the point at which its Revising Committee proposed to stop, no *question of principle* could remain between the parties touching the use of the press in this form, and then presuming upon these two assumptions, it proceeds to a third, namely, that the Church will be more *safe* in its keeping. The Union says, (Rep. of Rev. Com., p. 10,) "there is more danger from ultraisms, when men of one shade of sentiment withdraw and act together, than from error, when all classes meet as checks upon each other;" a reflection suggested to the mind of the Revising Committee, very naturally, by the work in which they are now engaged, which has grown out of the prevalence of one shade of sentiment, and a shade which by a summary process expelled every other shade. The Union is continually forgetting that it can be no more than a voluntary Society at last, and must continue as heretofore, liable to all the evils of elective affinity. We regret that it has suffered so severely from this exposure, but let it not be discouraged; experience is profitable, and it will find, notwithstanding, that the *advantages* of elective affinity (if it will learn to use them rightly) are greater than the disadvantages. But as yet the true idea of a voluntary society seems to have made no impression upon the understanding of the Committee; hence they say (page 11) that they "deprecate, unless in extreme cases, a remedy for error so un-church-like in its character, as that of separation for its correction." Separation from what? Is it un-church-like for any to print books except their Society? If this be intended to apply to the Evangelical Knowledge Society, we humbly suggest our right to complain. Either the Union is itself a voluntary Society or it is not. If not, then there is no need of argument; but if it be, why should not its managers be content to sail their own vessel? If, as they say, it be bound for the port of safety, observers will be sure to see it, and wish them favoring gales; nor will confidence and assistance be withheld after it has been earned. But as to any special claim of safety for the truth in that Union, this claim, to say the very least, is premature; and we even feel a sense



of injury by having it pressed upon us in view of the past. We judge of the *safety* of a ship by her *material*, her *build*, the *way she lies in the water*, the *way she is manned*, and the *success of her former voyages*. But we are not favorably impressed by the cry of safety, urged from the windows of a bark which has been upset in the first severe weather which it encountered, and this too before she has righted. We may wish her well; we may learn by her experience, and lend a helping hand to the utmost extent compatible with the safety of greater charges committed to ourselves.

Again, the Union addresses us in the name of Peace, and asks "whether every lover of peace and of the Church will not heartily respond to this Appeal," and give the Union their united support? and the idea is elsewhere encouraged, that this is the special effort of peace, and its friends the special friends of peace. We must confess that we feel all appeals upon this subject very deeply, and this on two accounts—first, because they always recall to us the prayer which burdened the heart of our blessed Lord in the night before he suffered. But we do not believe that this prayer of our Lord is an unanswered prayer, but on the contrary, that there is peace now among those that are his, to a far greater extent than is generally imagined, and a love which surpasses all the bounds of societies and churches. We also feel these appeals deeply on another ground. They bring up the memory of wrongs which the friends of peace have often suffered from pleas in its behalf. How often have we heard a man propound a theory perhaps in a convention sermon, or pamphlet, (in which with the Bible in our hands, it was impossible for us to concur,) and then assuming the truth of his theory, break out in behalf of peace, and tell how many souls are perishing because peace is violated, while in fact he means no more by peace than the liberty to prosecute his own views and plans without opposition!\* We do not apply this to the Committee, or believe that they would knowingly do this wrong, but we apply it to

\* How often do we hear the most fervent appeals about the evils of controversy from those who are its true authors, as if they would enforce their authority and their errors by picturing the calamities which must accompany their resistance; reminding us of the priests of the sixteenth century, who by multiplying images of terror, controlled at their will an ignorant and depraved people, boasting that but for Luther they could have persuaded the Germans to eat hay.



*all*, and especially to those for whom we feel most concern, and beg them, while they labor and pray more and more for peace, to separate their appeals in its behalf from every theory, scheme, or plan, which must not only hazard their acceptance by the party to whom they are addressed, but produce a contrary effect, by provoking the suspicion of art.

But surely the Committee do not mean to say that to defend the truth, even controversially, is to violate peace. Although the Evangelical Knowledge Society has never published anything so disruptive of what some call peace as, for example, the "Considerations Addressed to the Laity," we can not perceive how its publication by a Society instead of an individual would have made it any more so. If a tract be true and of good tendency, as we think this was, then the more effective the machinery for circulating it the better.

Nor can the Revising Committee mean to say that those can not be lovers of peace and of the Church who are not prepared to obey their call. Surely, they can not be thus unmindful of the relationship between the parties speaking and the parties spoken to; nor can they mean to reprove sober Churchmen who have been, in the judgment of others besides themselves, the real conservators of peace and of the Church: but speaking for a school which has been so long in the habit of resorting to this line of argument, we suppose it was difficult for them to avoid it. But we trust, that upon reflection, their own love of peace will not allow them to propound adherence to the Protestant Episcopal Sunday-School Union as a test of the genuineness of it in others.

Not a few of those from whom they will receive no replies to their Appeal, are sincere lovers of peace, whether taken as a grace of the Spirit, or a condition of ecclesiastical life. They value above all things, the peace of God, peace in believing, and peace among all the children of the Lord; although we can not but foresee that as with Him who first preached the Gospel, the effects of the true principles of peace under some circumstances, and for a time, will be the disturbance of outward unity. That peace which is purchased by a stipulated *silence* about a doctrine so connected with the eternal life of the soul as that of "baptismal regeneration," not only as heretofore urged by the controllers of the Union, but by not a few



"High-Churchmen," is peace in no Christian sense. When the Papists wished to avoid the odium of burning a heretic who would not recant, they asked him if he did not love his wife and children? "Yes," he said, "I love them so well that I would not part with one of them for all the wealth of the Duke of Brunswick, (whose subject he was;) but when it comes to denying the truth of Jesus, then farewell wife and children too."

Let the question of *doctrine* be settled, and the question of peace will settle itself. It is by being all assimilated to Christ in doctrine and in spirit, that Christians become assimilated to one another. Christian peace does not consist merely in keeping still or in avoiding contention, for it is enjoined by divine authority to contend for the faith; but it consists in avoiding all mere human antagonism, and in being kind and respectful and charitable and patient to all.

This peace has been increasing in the Church for some years, and more through the influence of the Evangelical Knowledge Society than from any other *one* cause whatsoever; and we pray that this movement of the Sunday-School Union may not put back the cause to the extent of its natural tendency; for if any *one* platform is to be urged for all, be it known that the friends of the Evangelical Knowledge Society are prepared to press *theirs*, nor do they doubt their ability to prove it the true platform of God's word, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church. But there are those who with their present professed opinions can not stand on this platform, nor can we invite them to it until they shall have been led to see the errors into which they have fallen. That the Evangelical Knowledge Society will be the means of so leading them we have not the smallest expectation, but that so far as it finds access it will, through the blessing of God, be the means of preserving those who are uncommitted, and also prove a means of rich spiritual blessing to its own members and friends, we have no doubt at all.

But the assault of the Union upon the Evangelical Knowledge Society, has been followed up by a more formal one from a private hand in the same interest, which we presume would obtain a much more unanimous and cordial vote in the Union than the report of its Revising Committee. This attack is



directed first against the evangelieal party in the Chureh, or a portion of it. It is said that "there is a section of the evangelieal party—God forbid that I should make such a charge against the mass—that have a fault as promotive of discord as any that can be named; it is that of spiritual pride, leading to harsh judgment and intoleranee. One of that section to which I refer makes his evangelieal views a mere party matter, with no real love for them, or true knowledge of them; he has the whole theory of experimental religion at his tongue's end; he can define justification by faith with theologial aceuracy, and he sets down those who differ a shade from him in their way of expressing the doctrine as utterly ignorant of experimental godliness; \* \* \* \* in short, his whole temper is arrogant, exclusive, and intolerant. In my judgment, for unfruitfulness or for kindling a flame of diseord, there is no drier stick in the Lord's vineyard than this."

We can not at all see the relevaney of this to the matter in hand; but we are prepared to admit all this, and have eopied it at length, in order to give it a wider eirculation, with the hope that it may reach any to whom it may apply, with the added prayer that it may not be rejcted as eoming from an unfriendly source. This has been seen and lamented from the time of Cecil, Cadogan, and Venn. But we believe that those to whom this censure applies are not numerous, and that their number is diminishing and not inereasing.

But we are prepared to go farther than this if it be desired, and to admit—as we presume the Evangelieal Knowledge Society would—much more that is wrong among its friends. The following extraet from one of its own publications, issued about two years ago, will show how they speak to one another upon this subject; and we trust it will be received again in eonjunction with the rebuke administered above, apart from all controversy in a frame of humble and faithful self-examination.

"We would watchfully perform our part as defenders of the Protestant faith. But the mission of the Society is not a mission of controversy, at least in any other sense than that in which the mission of St. Paul was a mission of controversy. Its mission is to *evangelize*, and to evangelize in the Church. It would begin at home. It has a mission of love and faithfulness to its own members and friends. We who are engaged in it, clergy and laity, would deeply feel the responsibility of our position in these times. In one view the sphere of our operation is not extensive, but in another it is, and its



importance can not be overrated. Are we fit instruments for this work? How much it concerns us to ascertain our own errors in spirit and in action—to humble ourselves before God, and for the time forgetting every thing else, to confess and bewail with true repentance our coldness and unbelief, our self-seeking and love of popularity, our supineness and neglect of the great opportunities by which we are surrounded, our low appreciation of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come of which we have tasted, and even our carnality in controversies which have become a part of our solemn duty. We would earnestly pray for grace and wisdom equal to our day, under a solemn apprehension that our whole success under God will depend upon the spirit in which our mission is conducted.”

If, however, the author of these criticisms upon the evangelical party will believe it, the spiritual benefit and improvement of themselves and friends who were wholly agreed in doctrine, entered largely into the views of the most active promoters of the Society; and they entertain the humble hope that this part of their design has not been without profit, though not in such measure as they have wished and still hope for.

Again, much obloquy has been cast upon evangelical men for joining with other denominations in Bible and general Sunday-School and Tract Societies; but we never could see any just ground for such reproaches. From the peculiar state of our country and of the world, Christians have thought good to combine, in this form, to teach certain primary truths of religion, at points which no one of the parties singly could so well reach with those truths. Nothing is taught about which there is any dispute among the parties; and as to the truths left *untaught*, their importance is not denied but admitted and affirmed by them all; and the right is conceded, if not the duty enjoined, of teaching them through appropriate societies or other agencies. In deference to the views of some whom we love, we have endeavored to see the inconsistency of this course among those who are trying to evangelize the world; but we are wholly unable to see it. We have never heard of Unitarians uniting in any of these societies, except to a small extent in the Bible Society. If they do this, it is their lookout, not ours; for we hold that a society for circulating the holy Scriptures is a good Trinitarian Society. But this objection certainly can not be urged against the Evangelical Knowledge Society, for it is composed entirely of members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, organized for teaching through the press their entire position as Christians and as Churchmen,

and in our opinion a studied and promised silence upon questions upon which it can not be said that "Churchmen are generally agreed," would be justly liable to the charge of dishonest concealment and an unpardonable compromise of the truth.

But five specific objections have recently been urged against the Evangelical Knowledge Society. We are truly glad of the opportunity of considering them all, and we choose to do so without any reference to names, so that they may stand upon their own merits, and, as far as possible, prejudice or displeasure to individuals be avoided.

These objections are introduced by a concession of the right to organize the Society—a concession of no value, since the *moral right* to organize is immediately denied; and it is *this* moral right alone which is of any account to conscientious men.

It is objected—

I. That "The Evangelical Knowledge Society does not seem to deal with error in the scriptural way," citing the case of Aquila and Priscilla with Apollos. It is true that the first Christians had no "Book Societies," and for very good reasons; but this surely will not be urged as of weight by the Sunday-School Union. The *scripturalness* of treating error by such societies depends upon the conformity of their way to that of the apostles. Does not the Evangelical Knowledge Society propound scriptural truth with distinctness and energy, yet with meekness and calmness? And did not St. Paul deal thus with Judaizing teachers and errors in the churches of Galatia? Did he refrain from publishing his doctrines and his censures to the whole body of Christians there through fear of disturbing the *unity* of that Church? We humbly suggest, (and not, we hope, without effect, to the authors of this objection,) that the SCRIPTURAL mode of dealing with error is plain, honest, outspoken *truth*. It does not preclude denunciation even. "*To whom we gave place,*" said Paul, "*by subjection not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you.*" He withstood Peter to the face—warned the Galatians against another gospel, even though preached by an angel from heaven. He cautioned Timothy and Titus against false doctrine; and St. John enjoined Christians to *try the spirits whether*



*they were of God*; cases far more pertinent to the matter in debate than that of Aquila and Priscilla's tenderness to Apollos—an application of Scripture, by the way, not specially flattering to the High-Church party.

The universal application of that canon, that “general principles are to be laid down and left to make their own application,” would be a manifest and palpable repudiation of the *SCRIPTURAL* way of dealing with error. Our blessed Lord, the living impersonation of charity, did not always, nor even commonly, lay down general principles, and leave them to make their own application, but he made the application himself. Hence he attacked the priests, and he attacked the lawyers, and he attacked the Scribes and Pharisees, and showed how *their* teaching destroyed *his*. The people *needed* this; nor do they need it one whit less now than they did then—a position covering more ground than is necessarily involved in this Apology, and adduced to settle a principle. Again, it is added, under this first objection, “If evangelical men feel that they have a better faith than their High-Church brethren, it is their duty not to draw off, etc., but to associate kindly with them, and seek to impart to them their clearer views \* \* and their superior gifts.” This language of the objector can hardly be deemed serious; but whether it be or not, we wish our answer to be considered as not only serious, but most emphatically solemn and earnest. Have not evangelical men associated kindly with their brethren in various ecclesiastical proceedings and works of charity though often to their disadvantage, not to say their suffering of conscience, in order to promote unity? This they would *still* do, and even endeavor, through their Evangelical Knowledge Society, and other publications, like Aquila and Priscilla, (to use the objector's own illustration,) to “teach them the way of God more perfectly,” but none know better than he that an attempt to do this, *directly* after the manner of Aquila and Priscilla, would be deemed an insult, and we have too much respect for the understanding of High-Churchmen to attempt that upon them *indirectly*, which, by the terms of the compact, we should not be allowed to attempt *directly*; nor would we expose ourselves to their just reproaches for such a course. The “views” of evangelical men, to which the objector alludes, are not only very “*clear*,” but they are very *dear*

to them, and how can he demand of them to join in a Society, where they would not only have no *opportunity* to “*impart*” them, but where they could not themselves *possess* them in print, except through *private* channels, which then would most surely be accounted “unauthorized,” as compared with a “Church Society”?

The Sunday-School Union proposes *compromise* and mutual concession. *It* will concede, or promises to concede, what? “*Tractarianism*.” And what will evangelical men be expected to concede? Why, the very principles which *distinguish* them as evangelical. So far from finding an opportunity of “*imparting* their clearer views,” they would have to keep silence about them, for the sake of peace. This is the very proposition. They could not *teach* them, because they are not views “*about which Churchmen generally are agreed*.” And are principles distinctly evangelical, touching both doctrine and the Church, of so little value that they may be compromised in this way, with a good conscience, by those who hold them, and this in an organization confessedly voluntary? If these views are true and important, why not *teach* them?

But they may be taught *privately*, we are told. True, and so may High-Churchism be taught privately. As *individuals*, A, B, and C may print evangelical tracts, sermons, and Sunday-school books, (perhaps not Sunday-school books) without a breach of unity; but they must not *combine* to do this, but leave all the advantages of such combination, economy, effectiveness, system, and permanence, to those who teach other and opposite principles. If A, B, and C have no moral right to do this work conjointly, they have none to do it singly. The reader will pardon an argument upon so plain a proposition. The claim to the exclusive use of the press in this form, by any party, is without a parallel in the Church of *England*, and that it should be seriously urged in *this Church, and in this age, and in this country*, is truly amazing.

But in the absence of strong reasons against the Society, we must needs go on to answer such as are given. We are told further that the work of the Evangelical Knowledge Society is *temporary*, and that, when it is over, it will not know what to do with its “*forts, stockades*,” etc., which will be left a useless armament in time of peace. Alas! how differently do people



judge of the *past*, the *present*, and the *future*, and how very feebly is the scope and purpose of the Evangelical Knowledge Society apprehended! As to the "great forts and stockades" which it is erecting, touching its main work, they have been needed ever since the fall of Adam, and touching its special work, they have been needed in the Episcopal Church ever since the lapse into semi-Romanism of Archbishop Laud; and we fear that the necessity for these "stockades" is likely to continue for some time, notwithstanding the new platform of the Sunday-School Union; or if the objection lies against any special piece of ordnance on the Society's fortifications, such as that great one named "*The Contrast*," then be it known that its existence will be just as temporary as the work which it has to perform, and we will engage that when the time comes for suppressing the "*Considerations addressed to the Laity*," the plates of "*The Contrast*" shall be put into the same furnace and melted to their original lead. And this can be done without any perceptible opening in the batteries of the Society, that will be left for playing on other portions of the walls of Satan's kingdom. History must have been studied to little purpose by those who think that the seminal principle of Tractarianism is a novelty, or that its developments, in one form or other, are to be annihilated by "a few shots or heavy volleys." No, no. The combatants in this long war may indeed exclaim with wearied Jacob, "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord." But though, in the form of *peace in the truth*, they have in every age "*waited for this salvation*," they have "*died without the sight*;" nor must their successors in this age expect to be more happy.

But we are further told (still under the first objection) that "the tendency of the Evangelical Knowledge Society is to separate, not merely from Tractarianism, but from old-fashioned High-Churchism." This objection can have no force but by assuming that High-Churchism is the truth. Differences, not so great as with Tractarians and Romanists, may yet be real and serious, as in this case. Palpable evidence of this may be found in the history of the High-Church party, from the time of James I. The revival of evangelical religion, at the close of the last, and beginning of the present century, met with no more strenuous and decided opposition than from this very quarter.



And when Tractarianism appeared, "old-fashioned High-Churchism," with very few exceptions, showed it favor, and never would allow Conventions, General or Diocesan, where it had the power, to say one word against it; while in the Board of Trustees of the General Seminary, and managers of the Sunday-School Union, it allowed Tractarianism to *rule*. And shall Low-Churchmen seize the first hand that is offered them, the conditions of the grasp being that they shall go upon the platform of Bishop Hobart, whose views of baptismal regeneration, as they conscientiously believe, tend, and gravitate, and press historically and logically toward those of Pusey and Ives; surrendering their very *citadel*, upon High-Churchism *promising* to give up its outpost of Tractarianism? Low-Churchmen have suffered too much by compromises to accept such an one, if it were a mere question of expediency. But it is not a question of expediency at all. It is a question of *principle*, sacred PRINCIPLE.

Contracts to stop at a certain point in teaching what the contracting parties consider the essentials of religion, are dangerous things, and they never prosper. If there be any essential doctrine of the Gospel it is that of Justification, and this would feel the first effects of the insidious compromise. The practicability of such compromise seems to be assumed from the citation of Bishop Griswold's pastoral letter on that doctrine as having had the unanimous concurrence of the House of Bishops. That letter was very admirable of its kind, and has been and will be kept in circulation by the evangelical press. But it is not decisive of present controversies, as will at once appear upon inspection to the accurate theologian, and as must be evident to every one from the fact that all the Bishops consented to it. As against the Tractarian view of justification, either Hooker, the Homilies, or the Article itself are much less easily evaded than that pastoral. Under the present circumstances of the Church, letters of the House of Bishops can be of little doctrinal value, because they must either represent a part of the House only, or else at the very points where some decisive doctrinal teaching is called for, they become so general as to decide nothing, and so are for any real necessity nugatory. It is said in apology that this is the best they can do; and shall we then follow that as an example



which the Bishops upon experiment deplore as an inconvenience? The history of the House of Bishops touching pastorals, which is appealed to in proof of the practicability of a general Union to teach religion by the press, proves precisely the contrary. Even the pastoral referred to as having been satisfactory to all, was *not* satisfactory to all. As already intimated, it was by some deemed too vague and ambiguous at the very points where the true meaning of the reformers, of the Article, and of the Scriptures was sought to be undermined, while the general drift and end which it seemed to aim at was equally distasteful to others.

The last pastoral is a case still more in point. It gave little satisfaction either in the House or out of it. We are persuaded there were not more than four of the Bishops who would have originated it as expressive of their own views; and we have reason to believe that a large majority of the clergy either left it unread in the churches or accompanied the reading by numerous comments of their own, conceiving that the people could not derive a just and adequate view of the matters brought forward in the pastoral, from the pastoral alone, and simply because it was the offspring of compromise. In fact, matters so numerous and so serious have to be compromised in order to the possibility of any pastoral at all, that a respectable and growing number of the Bishops are inclining to the opinion that they would better consult their true dignity, conscientiousness, and candor by publishing nothing as from the whole, but allowing the President, as in 1850, to publish any thing he might please in his own name.

The House of Bishops then, taken as a Union for teaching upon religion, are entangled in a necessity which none of them would choose (as was signally proved in the only attempt ever made as elsewhere referred to,) and shall we who are free entangle ourselves in the same? Will ministers consent to any such trammels in their sermons, or Christian parents in their families? What then will be gained to truth or peace by our uniting in a Society to print books upon Justification, which, no matter whether their language be *selected* from the Bible or the Prayer-Book, leave it doubtful whether such employed formulas as "*justified through the merits of Christ by faith*" be used in the Protestant or Romish sense—whether "without



works" is to be taken only as works done before grace, or "by the merits of Christ alone," only as those merits obtain the grace whereby the sinner seeking justification does good works—or whether "by faith only," because faith is the parent of all good works?

We are not at all deterred from these distinctions because men stigmatize them as the Shibboleth of party. Let them remember that "Shibboleth" was the countersign of the true Israel, while those who could only say "Sibboleth" thereby stood revealed as the public enemies, and were slain at the passages of Jordan. Or men may affect to make light of distinctions going below those generalities in which error delights as a "hair-splitting theology." But upon the distinctions indicated above rests the corner-stone of Protestantism. With far better reason might you disparage the pertinacity of the Greeks who contended on the doctrine of the Trinity, not merely for a particular word, but for a word which differed from another word only by a single *letter*. Yet on that letter hung the orthodoxy of Christendom, and there the stream of infidelity parted from the stream of true religion, though at an angle so acute that it could only be detected by means of instruments which had been most accurately adjusted by the word of God. Religious teachers may use what modes of illustration they prefer, but unless they embrace the *substance* of the *Scripture* doctrine of justification, in the love of it, no matter what language they may subscribe, the genius, spirit, and actings of their religion will be so diverse from theirs who do embrace it, that the union of the two for working the press will be confusion. One of the parties, if not both, will be injured. Neither can be benefited. Under all compromises such as that proposed, evangelical truth must suffer, while its opposite will gain; because evangelical truth depends on plain, well-defined, and pointed doctrinal teaching, while its opposite has as little as possible to do with questions of doctrine, and is often ready to compromise them in form, so only that a system of externals is adopted which will ultimately insure all of doctrine that is desired.

But finally, under objection first, we are told that "evangelical men will never win their opponents by a party Society." Did they ever win them by uniting in a High-Church Society,



and consenting to put their own views out of sight and hearing? Truth by itself has never won the enemies of truth, *but it has often silenced them.* What “winning” would there be by evangelical men who should put themselves in a position where the very *mention* of their distinctive principles would be frowned upon as tending to strife and division, a breach of the compact, causing them to be stigmatized as “*party*” men?

But the winning of opponents is not in the thoughts of the Evangelical Knowledge Society. Although *assaults* occasionally will raise “oppositions,” as unfortunately at present, yet if the author of these objections can believe it, the Evangelical Knowledge Society has met for days in frequent session when *apparently* (the present writer can speak for one) the idea of “*opponents*” was not in any man’s mind.

Their work is *positive*, and if Tractarianism and High Churchism should this day cease from troubling, the work would scarcely be less great and pressing than it is now. When will the true and entire position of this institution be admitted, either from the declarations of its conductors, or its published works? Take the following extracts from its last Triennial Report:

“The Society is an organ in the proper sense of the word—the necessary channel and voice of utterance for principles and feelings which have always been in the Church, and constituted its life; and the Church, guided by the Spirit of God, will instinctively create for herself her proper organs of utterance, at the times when the necessities of her life require them. \* \* \* \*

“But we do not forget that it was embraced in the comprehensive design of the Society to publish tracts and books to defend the Church from errors propagated *within* her pale—a work absolutely necessary in a time of innovation, corruption, and apostasy. This part of its duty the Society intends to discharge with promptness and energy, so long as the necessity for it shall continue—avoiding antagonism, *but never sacrificing any important principle, or allowing it to be kept out of sight for the sake of PEACE*; being conscientiously satisfied that such a course is not only wrong in itself, but that it will sooner or later be found to involve the most disastrous consequences to the cause of peace itself. Let the friends of truth consent to hold their views in abeyance for the sake of peace, and there will not be wanting those who will see to it that there shall be no peace in the Church, except upon a foundation which puts the vital doctrines of the Gospel out of sight, and substitutes a system which has decoyed numbers of our people into the Roman Catholic Church, including a Bishop, with some ten or twenty presbyters, already gone. But that controversy was not intended to be its principal work, is known to those engaged in its formation; and that it has not been so in fact, is abundantly proved by its published works, there not being, in a catalogue of fifty, more than four or five that are of a controversial character. The policy of the institution is to preach by means of the press within our Church the unadulterated Gospel of Christ. Its object is well expressed in its name—THE



PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF EVANGELICAL KNOWLEDGE, the knowledge of the Bible, the knowledge of the Prayer-Book, the knowledge of all evangelical truth, as the same has been received by the Church, and expressed in her authorized standards. This view is clearly presented in the second article of the Constitution, which says: 'The object of the Society shall be to maintain and set forth the principles and doctrines of the Gospel embodied in the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the publication of tracts, Sunday-school, and other books.'

\* \* \* \* "The rationalism and Romanism of the unconverted human heart can never be overcome but by the Spirit of God acting through the truth; and this not ordinarily in the shape of disputation, but in teaching Christ crucified, that mighty, that soul-subduing and soul-converting doctrine of the new covenant. \* \* \* The great body of these works will continue as heretofore to teach Christianity, simply in its Scriptural form, as if there were no controversy in the world."

OBJECTION II.—"Because its tendency is to perpetuate and increase party differences. It is an entering wedge to divide the Church." When did the particular "differences" here referred to commence as to the essence of them? *Two hundred and fifty years ago*, and the succession has been kept up to this day. Have the evils of it among us been aggravated since the formation of the Evangelical Knowledge Society? Precisely the reverse. Error has suffered, but truth and peace have gained, and so *some* progress has been made toward that just settlement, which, though delayed, will surely come "an entering wedge to divide the Church." Has the Church Missionary Society (a voluntary Low-Church Society) been an entering wedge to divide the Church of England? Just the opposite. This is what High-Churchmen have always said (and as in this case without proof) of every measure of real efficiency adopted by evangelical men. When the Maine Law was in danger of passing, it was said with horror, that "it would produce *bloodshed*." It passed, but there was no blood shed, or tears shed, but on the contrary, rivers of tears were dried up by it.

"Already we hear of opposing Quarterlies."\* Are opposing

\* As one out of a large number of provocations to an Evangelical Quarterly, see the "Church Review's" commendatory notice of "A Presbyterian Minister Looking for the Church," April, 1853. There were circumstances connected with this notice, which will not be given unless they are called for, which destroyed all remaining confidence in the "Church Review's" professions of impartiality, and caused the necessity for a new organ in this department to be felt next to universally among evangelical Churchmen acquainted with the facts. It was no part of our purpose to touch this question, even in an "Apology," but "ye have compelled us."



quarterlies more perilous than opposing weeklies? "Of a separation in Foreign and Domestic Missions." But this dates from 1835, the golden, but, as it has proved, fallacious age of unity. "Of a Tractarian and Evangelical Seminary." Although the Evangelical Knowledge Society has no more to do with these things than the author of these objections, we must needs answer, How came there to be a Tractarian Seminary? Did it not, as soon as the temptation was offered, spring out of the very platform now urged, although the whole Church was represented (though very unequally) in that seminary? When the intrinsic proclivity of this platform to diverge further and further from evangelical views, comes to work itself out, as it surely will, the presence or persuasions of evangelical men has never been able to oppose any effectual hindrance. We refer in proof to some *unwritten* parts of the Lives of Griswold and Milnor. As to the *Evangelical Seminary*, which is more dangerous to *unity* than the Evangelical Knowledge Society, we had supposed that our High-Churchmen had long since conceded the right, legal and moral, to have such, though in this case there is in existence a *General Seminary* established, and responsible, at least in theory, to the General Convention. But the objector is quite consistent. If his objections are good against the Evangelical Knowledge Society, they are much better against an *Evangelical Seminary*, and the first step must be to break up that at Alexandria. "The next and easy step may be to have High and Low-Church Bishops, with rival conventions in the same diocese." But as it is not shown *why* or *how* this is the "next and easy step," it surely can not be expected of *us* to see it. We can not see *why* the "step" from the publications of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, even the few which may be called controversial, is any more "easy" than from some of the reviews of Bishop McCoskry's sermon, which have emanated from private hands. If it were any thing relevant to this discussion, we could easily tell how such divisions will arise, should they ever take place. That is to say, just as they always have arisen—from the force and intolerance of majorities deeming themselves strong enough to deprive minorities of their just rights. The spirit of schism is the spirit of those who can tolerate no doctrines, periodicals, societies, measures, or men, except their own. "Leading men in



the Evangelical Knowledge Society have themselves freely admitted to me their fears of such a result from the actual working of its machinery." This is the first intimation of the sort which we have ever heard, even in the most hypothetical way. We had supposed that if we knew any thing well, it was the views of the leading members of this Society, and we can only express our astonishment at having failed to hear this before.

"A minority ever so small, with truth on its side, has nothing to fear in any body where free discussion is allowed." But free discussion is the very thing which the Sunday-School Union is trying to prevent, except upon terms which will insure its greatest facilities to itself.

OBJECTION III.—"I object to the Evangelical Knowledge Society, because it is not the instrumentality with which evangelical men can best succeed." We are glad that the objector wishes well to their work: but why not let *them* judge of the means by which they can best succeed? Surely this body contains some men of wisdom and foresight, and they thought and prayed for two or three years before they acted. After an experiment of seven years, its members are unanimously of a very different opinion, and have a better opportunity certainly of judging, than one who is so aloof as thus to have misconceived the inner life and forth-acting genius of the Society. And, moreover, if this is so bad an organ for evangelical men to work with, why this exceeding anxiety of the Union to break it down? Has the Union such a superior concern for the prosperity of the evangelical cause as to wish to take its concerns in charge?

"Their strength lies in faithful preaching of the Gospel in churches more flourishing than those of brethren who differ from them, in larger contributions to missions, in Sunday-schools like that of St. George's," etc. If it be meant that such sources of strength are *peculiarly* theirs, then what have they to gain by union upon such unequal terms with those whose peculiar sources of strength are supposed to lie in something else?

No doubt the strength of evangelical men lies mainly in these things; and their adhesion to the Evangelical Knowledge



Society, so far from involving a denial of this, only shows that they have the intelligence to perceive the means by which they can work these sources of strength to the best advantage. The Evangelical Knowledge Society is, in fact, the very *creature* of the necessities which they felt in the working of these their sources of strength. Ask the architect and presiding genius of that mighty Sunday-School referred to what *he* thinks of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, though he is no officer of it, and never has been. Ask what he thinks would be the effects of shutting up that school to the issues of the "Church Book Society," or what would be the effects upon the Church of its success in its present endeavor to undermine the evangelical press.

As it respects Sunday-schools, the minister can not personally examine all the literature which they demand at this day. He must have a general guarantee for their soundness and spiritual adaptation to their work. And shall an institution which, by the confession of its own advocates, has betrayed its trust, and which now finds itself so hampered that it can give but small promises and still smaller performances of amendment, demand that all other supplies shall be stopped?

Shall it be demanded of evangelical men alone, that they shall cease from teaching and preaching, through an organized press which they are using to the conversion and edification of many? We can but ask who it is that makes this demand, and in what age we live?

As to what is said under this head about "caucuses, carnal weapons," etc., we are glad to find that the objector thinks they do not well become "evangelical men." We think so too, and can truly say that we have seen nothing in the Society which could be justly so characterized. They are much less likely to occur with men who feel their strength and freedom than with those who are subjected to the domination of others. And we submit it to the judgment of all experience and knowledge of human nature, whether, under the present circumstances of our Church, the proposition with which the Sunday-School Union comes forward would not in its operation lead to more intrigue and party manœuvering than almost any other that could be invented? The proceedings of the Evangelical Knowledge Society have been open and manly; and we challenge the



proof to the contrary, and appeal to the public whether, as to party strife, which party men so much deprecate, there has not been, since the formation of the Society, more dignity, and kindness, and respect in controversy, than there was before? Will not the present controversy, for an example, compare favorably on both sides with any conducted in the Church before 1847, which involved such mighty interests? But it is further objected against the Evangelical Knowledge Society, that its enemies have compared it to the Ecclesiological Society. This may be so. It has certainly been compared to Bishop Ives' Secret Society of the Holy Cross; but this does not necessarily prove any thing. Some said that our Lord was mad, and had a devil; but he did not on that account cease to teach. We would ask, moreover, what possible *benefit* the members of the Evangelical Knowledge Society could hope to derive from a union with men who make such comparisons?

OBJECTION IV.—“Troublous influence upon parishes.” If any such effect is produced, it will be by industrious attempts to prejudice the minds of the laymen in question by false representations of the spirit and object of the Society. No doubt such attempts will be made, and may sometimes be successful; but the enmity which originates them lies deeper than the Evangelical Knowledge Society. It is hostility to the great distinctive features of the *Gospel*. It labors to disquiet and supplant men who faithfully *preach* it, as well as those who unite to *print* it. It existed before the present age, and would not cease though the Evangelical Knowledge Society should be dissolved to-day. The faithful minister must never be surprised at its manifestation. The offense of the cross has not ceased.

But as a practical hindrance to the Society, this is over-stated. For a considerable time past, it need rarely have been inferred, from the sermons and addresses of the Society's agents, that there was any controversy in the Church. Why? Because the Society's principles are KNOWN. Its principal work in pulpits is like its principal work at the Depository, evangelical abstractly and not controversially; so that a Tractarian hearer need not be specially disturbed except by such truths as are necessary to the salvation of the soul. Besides, Tractarian



hearers will generally find Tractarian preachers, especially in cities. In the country, or where there is but one parish in a place, Tractarians among the *people* are not very common. Generally, they are good sound Protestants, and more ready than their ministers to fight for the Protestant cause; and our belief is as often expressed, that a very large majority of the PEOPLE, even with High-Church rectors, hold in doctrine with the Evangelical Knowledge Society, and would subscribe every line of its tract, entitled, "Distinctive Principles."

OBJECTION V.—"The Evangelical Knowledge Society is not accomplishing its object." What is alleged under this objection is kindred to that which appears in Objections III. and IV., and this must excuse the similarity of our reply.

Why not let the friends of the Society judge for themselves whether it is accomplishing its objects? They, through their correspondence and wide ramification, must have a better opportunity of knowing than any single individual without.

"It acts like abolition societies," etc. This may be plausible, that is, with some persons. But where are the proofs? Had there been any, we may be sure they would not have been spared. Let the reader examine and judge every line it has printed, and say whether this accusation is just or unjust. The Evangelical Knowledge Society *is* accomplishing its object; and that we may not deal in mere assertion or opinion, we will give one fact out of very many, and that is the very "revision of the Sunday-School Union." In all fairness and candor, will not the Church owe this revision, so far as it goes, to the *Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge*? We know that the public have been cautioned against this conclusion; but we are entirely willing that persons should judge for themselves. But the Evangelical Knowledge Society makes no boast of this; far from it. It is little in comparison with what it hopes to see accomplished, though not probably in the lifetime of its present members.

"Such is the bitter hostility against the Society by those who are supposed to be in danger of Tractarianism, that the mere sight of its imprint upon a book would cause it to be left untouched, or to a worse fate." A most instructive passage, truly. And whence this "bitter hostility"? Surely it can not be to



the *persons* of those who belong to the Society. It must be to their *doctrine*. A Bishop was so possessed by this "hostility" that he refused a list of his clergy to "Sword's Almanac," because its publishers had reported the existence and officers of the Evangelical Knowledge Society. And yet "there is substantial unity," we are told, "in the great body of Churchmen upon matters of vital interest." And these, too, are the persons under whose practical government evangelical men are invited to place themselves, and help to constitute the very *ecclesia docens*, by resigning to them the exclusive use of the press. And for what purpose? That like "Aquila and Priscilla," evangelical men, "may teach these persons the way of the Lord more perfectly." But surely the temper of Apollos is not very manifest in the pupils if they are properly described in this passage. Let Christians judge of the true cause of this hostility. It has not only burnt Episcopal Knowledge Society Tracts; it has burnt the Bible, and it has burnt men. It is a lamentation, and shall be for a lamentation.

But we were not ignorant of this. The chief works and publications of evangelical men have been ignored, as well from individuals as from societies, until it was possible to ignore them no longer. Take these very objections now being urged by the Union and its advocates against the Evangelical Knowledge Society: though they have been admitted freely into all the evangelical papers, not a line in defense has been allowed to appear in a single organ, Tractarian or High-Church, on the other side; and it is this unfairness which compels us to print in pamphlet to meet wide-spread misrepresentation. If we can get but one side through the High Church weekly press, what could we expect from a High-Church Society? TRUTH has no need of such pusillanimity.

Finally. "Depend upon it, the operation of the Evangelical Knowledge Society is to exasperate, to protract difficulty, and to prevent things from returning to their old channel." Oh! no, we shall not depend on this at all. And as to things returning to their old channels, this will never be. Things do not go backwards. Those channels are, in the main, deserted, filled, and dried up. The stream is working for itself a new bed, and the question is, whether it shall discharge its waters into the Tiber or into the Jordan. The idea of bringing our Church back to



its old theological or ecclesiastical stand-point of thirty years ago is simply absurd. The High-Church party was far enough from being right then ; and the upheavings which have since taken place will end not in retrogression, but in progress either to a point nearer to the truth or farther from it.

With the exception of a few persons, now getting old, the High-Church platform of Bishop Hobart has been repudiated by its former occupants themselves. Nearly all came at length to feel that they needed something "deeper and truer." One portion thought this "something" was to be found in the Gospel, in its evangelical aspect ; another and larger portion thought it was to be found in Tractarianism ; but the general results to the Church, of the whole thirty years, and especially of the last fifteen, have been an accession to the numbers and strength, absolutely and relatively, of the evangelical interest. This will not, probably, be denied.

Of these objections, taken as a whole, we may remark that, in substance, they are the very same which have been urged against every movement of evangelical men which had any promise of efficiency.

In some dioceses, to vote in conventions against ultra High-Church measures, is to be denounced as "party men, perpetuating strife and division." This is an art of controversy, which, while it can deceive no intelligent person, tends, beyond most others, to debauch the minds of those who resort to it.

It may be said that we should not raise any evangelical issue avowedly in terms. High-Churchmen have seldom or never raised a High-Church issue in this shape. It would not be popular with that portion of the laity who are more or less under their influence. Their method has been to claim to be the Church, to be above party, and represent all who differed from them as disturbers of the peace. Their organs of all sorts have assumed this tone, especially the Sunday-School Union. This was its claim in 1827, and still more loudly in 1846, and so through every stage of its mutations, on to the very borders of Romanism. This was its tone, more piercing than ever, in the mouth of its preacher, on the Sunday before the 18th day of October, 1853 : "*Spurning* all party influence, it diffuses its benefits to all alike," was his language, when the Union had actually determined upon a virtual confession of its extreme



one-sidedness. And this is its tone now equally in 1854, when it does not appear, from the Union's showing, either what it is, or is to be, except these two things: first, that it is to speak for the whole Church; speak how or when it may: and, secondly, that acquiescence in its speaking is to be a condition of peace.\*

Whether it be consistent with candor and truth in High-Churchmen to claim not to be a "party," is for them to decide; but in our humble apprehension *it is the part of honesty, of truth, of wisdom, of peace, and of love, in evangelical men to raise evangelical issues, where great evangelical interests are involved, and to adhere to them with all fidelity, and charity, and Christian kindness, and a prayerful frame of heart toward all. It is the policy of error to avoid such a course, but it is not the policy of truth.* TRUTH MAY LEAD ITS FOLLOWERS INTO TROUBLE, BUT IT WILL ALWAYS LEAD THEM THROUGH IT, AND OUT OF IT, TO THE ONLY SHORE OF SAFETY.

And now, in conclusion, let us briefly re-state the general question, and we are not sorry that an occasion for our doing so has arisen. There is a body of men in the Episcopal Church, Bishops, clergy, and laity, (of the last a very large majority,) who hold that the Prayer-Book, notwithstanding a few expressions, which, taken according to the sound of the words, (though in demonstrable contradiction to its main drift and purpose,) seem to look the other way, is in doctrine EVANGELICAL, and in discipline moderate or Low-Church, as held by Bishop White, the founder of the American Church, and as held, according to Bishop White, by the great body of the divines of the Church of England, most distinguished for talents and piety, from Cranmer down. That the Bible teaches these views, they have not a shadow of doubt. With the Reformers they are sure of being of one heart and soul. These views of doctrine and discipline they observe to be but rarely separated from each other, and they hold them to be fundamental in such sense that they can not compromise them. This portion of the Church was never so strong in its position scrip-

\* The peace of High-Churchism with evangelical religion is like the peace of the Romans with one of the provinces of Britain:

"Ubi solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant."—*Tacitus Agric.* 30.



turally, spiritually, historically, or logically, as it is now. In the process of its extension, there came to be a generally felt need of a press in full harmony with its spiritual life. In looking for such an agency, seven years ago, they found the only organized press of the Church in the hands of Tractarians, though without any other authority than such as they and their sympathizing friends had clothed them with. Under these circumstances, they followed the example of all parties in the Church of England, including every Missionary Society, and organized avowedly on the voluntary basis. They organized that they might preach the truth in print, without any bar or hindrance, and especially that they might procure a more effective literature in the work of the conversion and sanctification of the soul, for those who felt their need of it. The Society was commenced by those who for geographical or other reasons were able to meet and consult together; it did not embrace the whole evangelical body, and the reason was plain and just. Some could not have knowledge of their own, and properly waited until they could obtain it, either from the practical working of the Society, or otherwise. The result is that now, with but here and there an exception, the whole body maintaining those views of doctrine and discipline just given, are either members or in known sympathy with this most useful, energetic, yet conservative institution. It is upon a basis which they approve.

The search of the Society is for divine authority and absolute truth, and the real spirit and intent of the Reformers and of the Prayer-Book, and these it intends to teach, without reference to the fact of their being "seriously objectionable to any large body of Churchmen," or not. The clergy and parishes for whom this was undertaken, have for nearly seven years had great comfort and recently great enlargement in it. Truth, with less mixture of controversy, has made itself felt upon the heart, and we have reason to know that souls are now rejoicing in hope of the glory of God, who owe their conversion directly to this Society as the instrument. It is chiefly occupied in work directly and earnestly spiritual, and it longs for the day when it may be wholly so occupied—a day which it fully expects. It has never been our privilege to attend upon any counsels or assemblies where there



was evinced a more humble and earnest desire to know the will of God, or to promote his glory, or where there were more evident marks of the presence of his Spirit. And shall this work be abandoned at the call of a Committee, who are not yet prepared to tell us what they will give us in its place, except at the very most that all our distinctive teaching will be suppressed, with only certain equivocal terms substituted in its stead? Oh! this sacrificing of practical usefulness to a mere outward unity and the mechanical conjoining of parties who never *did* unite in the use of the same press, and never *can*, without a degree of harmony and confidence which every intelligent observer of our Church knows does not now exist! And the hope of such harmony is idle while any considerable body of Churchmen remain to teach baptismal regeneration and the unchurching dogma, as they have been taught by this Union almost from its origin.

It is too late in the day, and perfectly vain, to think of *compromising* such doctrines as these. They are true, or they are not true, and too practically and deeply connected with the honor and will of God, and the present and future welfare of the soul, for a Christian people who are free, to smother without an object; and this, too, when they will certainly and speedily break out again, and with trumpet tongue demand a settlement. We say without an object; for a dead, mechanical unity, which is the most that could be hoped for under *such* a compromise, is no object at all.

And now, if this respected Committee would suffer a word from us—which but for their Appeal we should not have presumed to trouble them with—we would say, that whatever your individual views and wishes may be, or whatever in your individual capacity you may be permitted to say, the UNION professes to “*give up none of its peculiar views, but only the expression of them through this channel, and this for the sake of peace*”—that is, for the sake of inducing the other party to join it. The UNION does not *profess* to have changed its PRINCIPLES in the least, but only its POLICY. It admits itself to *carry* deadly weapons, but promises not to *use* them, whereas the law says you shall not CARRY deadly weapons. You must therefore excuse unarmed and peaceable citizens from coming into your Society.



Again : while a dozen or two eclectics may with perfect good faith enter upon the work which you undertook, the great majority on either side can not, and for the simple reason that it is not true, as you in the beginning asserted and believed, that there are but a small number who differ about any matters of vital interest ; and hence, in our judgment, the Union *proper* had very little sympathy, last October, with the work which you proposed to do for it ; and it has less now than it had then, although it may have got into such a position as not to be able to stop you in form. But you will find that you have not changed the reality of things much, while your labors will end in two results, one of which will be deplored by us, and both of which will probably be deplored by yourselves. You will rivet old prejudices not only against the Evangelical Knowledge Society, but against evangelical *truth*, and you will awake—in fact, have already awakened—a new interest in the Evangelical Knowledge Society among its friends. It will not cost us a great effort to repress the feelings which an attempt to supersede the Society would naturally produce ; and our prayer shall be, that this movement may be *overruled* for good to the Church whose future union in the faith and service of Christ is sure. But our hope of this glorious consummation rests not upon any “platforms” whatsoever, but upon the Holy Ghost accompanying in more abundant measure the purely evangelic labors of the people of God.

As it respects the Evangelical Knowledge Society, we could not well have greater evidence that it was begun in faith and in understanding, that it has been continued in faith and in understanding, and that the smile and approbation of God rests upon it ; and our humble prayer for it is that in principle, in spirit, and in continuance, it may be endowed with the power of an endless life.

If this movement against it, with the facts and discussions which it has brought out, has produced one conviction more universal among its friends than another, it is the conviction that the Society was not organized a day too soon, and that it can not be too firmly and liberally supported.

There are a multitude of people to whom you have only to mention the cause of evangelical religion in the Episcopal



Church, and you awaken all their enthusiasm and all their love.

As it respects the Sunday-School Union, so far as either through your labor or otherwise, it shall reflect the truth and spirit of the Scriptures, we wish for it the utmost success. How can we say more? And that the conduct of the Evangelical Knowledge Society toward it has not been inconsistent with this wish is evinced by the fact that it has purchased and circulated many of its books which it deemed unexceptionable, without regard to a reciprocity of its acts. With its operations we have nothing to do. Its responsibilities are not to us, but to Him who shall judge every institution in the persons of those who conduct them.

With respect to yourselves personally, we hope that no cold or unbrotherly feelings will be allowed to spring out of any Statements, Appeals, or Apologies; and we are concerned lest from the depth and distinctness of our convictions, we may have said any thing disrespectful or unkind, or which to you, who view things from such a different stand-point, may *appear* so. But you must not think us insensible to the blessings of unity and peace, or that we fall behind you in our desires and labors for both. But *union* must come first; and we can not see why we are not prepared for this in one form, and prepared NOW, and that is, *union in prayer for the Holy Ghost*, that all hearts may be swayed by its power. In entire and delightful concord as we suppose we must be on the question of the sole agency of the Holy Ghost as a guide to truth, and in our reliance upon the promise of the Holy Ghost to them that ask it, and especially to them who shall "agree" in asking it, why not make full and immediate proof of this union? Proposals for such a concert we are ready to make or to receive.







